

III. Amendments to the Drawings

Replacement sheet 3 of the drawings, which includes changes to Figure 3, is attached.

Specifically, Figure 3 was amended to add apertures 45 formed in the sleeve 39 so as to illustrate airbag tabs 14 extending therethrough. This amendment has in response to an objection that parts of the airbag extending through apertures in the sleeve in claims 10 and 15 must be shown or the features must be cancelled from the claims. Accordingly, Applicants believe that this amendment has cured the respective objections.

IV. Remarks

Claims 1-16 were pending in this application. The present amendment cancels claim 6, and amends claims 1, 10, 12 and 14 to more particularly point out and clarify Applicants' invention. No new matter has been added by the present amendment. After this amendment, claims 1-5 and 7-16 will be pending.

Reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Objections to the Claims

Claim 1-11, 14, and 15 were objected to. Claim 1 has been amended to recite "each of the mounting elements." This amendment was in response to an objection that Claim 1, line 13 "element" should be changed to "elements". Accordingly, Applicants believe that the amendment has cured the respective objection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as their invention.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite that "a roll with the lower deployable edge within the roll." This amendment was in response to the use of "its" in "a roll with its lower deployable edge within the roll" is improper.

Claim 10 was amended to recite “an air-bag according to claim 9.” This was in response to an objection that Claim 10 was dependent upon itself and was therefore indefinite.

Claim 12 was amended to recite that “the air-bag has an inflatable curtain.” This was in response to a rejection that “the air-bag of the type having an inflatable curtain” was indefinite because of the phrase “of the type”. Claim 12 was further amended to recite that “the inflatable curtain with the lower deployable edge.” This was in response to an objection that the phrase “the inflatable curtain with its lower deployable edge” was indefinite because of the use of “its.”

Claim 14 was amended to recite “a method according to claim 12.” This was in response to an objection that claim 14, a method claim, is dependent on claim 1, an apparatus claim. Therefore, claim 14 is rendered indefinite.

Applicants believe that the amendments discussed in the foregoing paragraphs have cured the respective 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejections of claims 1-16.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 11-13, and 16 were rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0158450 issued to Hoeft et al (“Hoeft”). Applicants have cancelled claim 6 by this response and therefore, the rejection of claim 6 is now moot.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of claims 1-3, 5, 7-8, 11-13 and 16 are traversed.

Claims 1 and 12 were amended to recite that each of the mounting elements are positioned substantially centrally of a corresponding adjacent pair of partitions. Support for this amendment may be found in Applicants' application at paragraphs [0010], [0035] and [0039].

Hoeft discloses a folded configuration for an air-bag curtain used for a safety restraint system. The air-bag curtain is inflatable between an occupant and a lateral surface of a vehicle, such as a door or side window. *Hoeft* at Abstract. The air-bag curtain 10 may be produced in two pieces which are attached together by various methods including sewing. Seams 63 are used to attach the pieces together to form a plurality of distinct chambers 65, each of which will hold gas. The air-bag curtain 10 also includes several attachment tabs 54. The attachment tabs 54 extend beyond the first edge 50 of the air-bag curtain 10 so that after the air-bag curtain is folded and rolled in a fully folded state. *Id.* at paragraphs [0030]–[0033]. As illustrated in Figure 3, the tabs 54 touch or overlap only one of the adjacent seams 63 while being substantially spaced apart from the opposed adjacent seam 63. Accordingly, the attachment tabs 54 are not be centrally positioned between the seams 63.

This is unlike applicant's invention as recited in claims 1 and 12 where each of the mounting elements are positioned substantially centrally of a corresponding adjacent pair of partitions. In that Hoeft lacks the noted element of claims 1 and 12, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection

based thereon should be withdrawn. Accordingly, Applicants believe claims 1 and 12 and their dependent claims 2-3, 5, 7-8, 11, 13, and 16 are in a condition for allowance.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 4, 9, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoeft in view of United States Patent No. 6,429,155 issued to Li et al. (“Li”). Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 4, 9 and 14 are traversed.

Since claims 4, 9 and 14 depend from claims 1 or 12 and since Li fails to disclose that each of the mounting elements are positioned substantially centrally of a correspondingly adjacent pair of partitions, the combination of Hoeft and Li can not render the claims of the present invention as obvious. The rejection under § 103(a) is therefore improper and should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims are patentably distinguishable over the art of record and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 9, 2008

/Steven L. Oberholtzer

Steven L. Oberholtzer (Reg. No. 30,670)

Attachment: Replacement Sheet(s) of Drawings.